

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review of the present application, and respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Claims Amendments/Status

By way of this reply, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite "a comparatively thicker area than a regular region of the base part corresponding to palmar surfaces of middle, ring, and little fingers and a palm portion along the ring and little fingers." These claim amendments find solid support in Figs. 1 and 11 and the associated text of the original specification. Further, claims 1, 10, 11, and 15 have been amended to improve clarity. No new matter has been introduced through these amendments.

Objection to the Claims

Claims 1, 10, 11, and 15 are objected to for informalities. By this reply, claims 1, 10, 11, and 15 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

1. Claims 1-7, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,089,600 ("Morita"). This rejection is traversed for the reasons presented below.

Applicant respectfully notes that Morita, filed on March 19, 2004 and published on August 15, 2006, does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (b), or (e), because the priority dates of the present application are January 13, 2004 and February 21, 2004. This is evidenced by the certified copy of the original applications on file. Verified translations of the original applications will be submitted subsequently. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is improper and must be withdrawn.

Even assuming that Morita is to qualify as prior art, claims 1-7, 9, and 10 are patentable over Morita for the following reasons. Morita fails to show or teach at least "a filling part formed on a region corresponding to a groove between a thumb and an index finger, one portion of dorsal surface and palmar surface of the thumb and the index finger,

and a lower part of the index finger and a thenar of the thumb of the palm, thereby providing a comparatively thicker area than a *regular region* of the base part corresponding to *palmar surfaces of middle, ring, and little fingers* and a palm portion along the ring and little fingers,” as required by independent claim 1. In the instant Office Action, the Examiner equates the crotch 7 and the first reinforcement coat 8 of Morita with the filling part as claimed. However, Figs. 1-3 of Morita show that the crotch 7 and the first reinforcement coat 8 are formed on the palmar surfaces of the middle, ring, and little fingers, and thus cannot correspond to the filling part as recited in claim 1. As such, Morita fails to show or suggest all of the features of claim 1, and thus claim 1 is patentable over Morita. Claims depending therefrom are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

2. Claims 11, 12, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,543,059 (“Szczesuil”). This rejection is traversed for the reasons presented below.

Amended independent claim 11 recites, in part, “a comparatively thicker area than a regular region of the base part corresponding to palmar surfaces of middle, ring, and little fingers and a palm portion along the ring and little fingers.” In one example, the regular region of the base part corresponding to the palmar surfaces of middle, ring, and little fingers and the palm portion along the ring and little fingers are thinner in general than the filling part (see, e.g., Fig. 11 and its associated text of the present application).

With respect to Szczesuil, the Examiner equates the coating 12 with the filling part as claimed. As is clear in Fig. 1 of Szczesuil, however, the coating 12 is formed on a region corresponding to the palmar surface of the middle finger. Therefore, the glove shown in Szczesuil does not have the regular region of the base part as claimed.

In view of the above, Szczesuil fails to show or suggest all of the features of claim 11, and thus claim 11 is patentable over Szczesuil. Claims depending therefrom are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

3. Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,845,519 (“Garneau”). This rejection is traversed for the reasons presented below.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, in part, “a comparatively thicker area than a regular region of the base part corresponding to palmar surfaces of middle, ring, and little fingers and a palm portion along the ring and little fingers.”

With respect to Garneau, the Examiner equates the cushion pad 16 with the filling part as claimed. However, the cushion pad 16 of Garneau is formed on the palm portion along the ring and little finger portions, which is shown in Fig. 1 of the Garneau. Thus, the filling part of claim 1 is distinct from the cushion pad 16 of Garneau.

In view of the above, Garneau fails to show or suggest all of the features of claim 1, and thus claim 1 is patentable over Garneau. Claims depending therefrom are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

4. Claims 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,154,885 (“Kobayashi”). This rejection is traversed for the reasons presented below.

Amended independent claim 11 recites, in part, “a comparatively thicker area than a regular region of the base part corresponding to palmar surfaces of middle, ring, and little fingers and a palm portion along the ring and little fingers.”

With respect to Kobayashi, the Examiner equates the stretch material 10 and the non-slip patch 7F with the filling part as claimed. However, as Fig. 1 of Kobayashi shows, the stretch material 10 and the non-slip patch 7B and 7A of Kobayashi are formed on the palmar surfaces of the ring and little fingers and the palm portion along the ring and little fingers. Thus, the filling part of claim 11 is distinct from the stretch material 10 and the non-slip patch 7F of Kobayashi.

In view of the above, Kobayashi fails to show or suggest all of the features of claim 11, and thus claim 11 is patentable over Kobayashi. Claims depending therefrom are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: November 24, 2009
YSH/SC/jr